

Appl. No. : 09/912,646
Filed : July 24, 2001

REMARKS

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 1-18. Claims 1, 7, 10, and 16 have been amended, and no new matter has been added. Thus, Claims 1-18 are presented for further examination. Reconsideration and allowance of all Claims 1-18 in light of the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 2, 4-11 and 13-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,239,797 to Hills, et al.

In regard to Claims 1 and 10, the Examiner stated that "Hills teaches a system (abstract) for providing a distributed software application (col. 1, line 5 – col. 2, line 20), comprising:

- a. A server (Fig. 1, #24) comprising a stored electronic main page (Fig. 1, #20), wherein the main page comprises at least two browser components (Fig. 2, #40) for displaying additional electronic pages within the main page (Fig. 3, #122);
- b. A client computer (Fig. 1, #32) comprising a browser program (Fig. 1, #38) configured to establish a communication link with the server (col. 2, lines 58 – col. 3, line 20) and display the stored electronic main page (col. 3, lines 35-60); and
- c. At least one software control on the main page (Fig. 2, #50 and #52) for selecting one of the at least two browser components to display in the browser program (col. 3, lines 35-60)."

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053.

Applicant respectfully submits that Hills fails to describe a main page comprising "at least two browser components for *displaying* additional electronic pages within the main page", and "at least one software control on the main page for selecting one of the at least two browser components to *display one of the additional electronic pages* in the browser program, *wherein each of the browser components are selectable by the software control*" as recited in amended Claim 1.

Appl. No. : 09/912,646
Filed : July 24, 2001

Hills describes a method for database scroll/update without refresh, wherein a browser 38 has three frames: a display frame 40, an update frame 48, and a scroll frame 44. *Hills at col. 3, lines 28-33.* Applicant notes that the Examiner stated on page 2, numbered para. 5, that “[w]hen the user selects a button to show the next record, the scroll frame becomes the display frame and the display frame becomes the scroll frame” However, Hills recites that the display frame 40 is the only frame visible to a user. *Col. 3, lines 36-39.*

The scroll frame 44 and update frame 48, although associated with the display frame 40, are hidden from the user and not selectable by software control for display of an additional electronic page. *Col. 4, lines 28-31.* When a user desires to scroll through data on an associated database, the user selects an appropriate arrow 50 with their mouse and the scroll frame 44 retrieves *data* from the associated database. *Col. 3, lines 39-42.* The retrieved scroll data is then *populated* into the appropriate *places* of the display frame without refreshing the entire screen. *Col. 3, lines 44-48; col. 4, lines 37-53.* The scroll data is not itself an electronic page, and the display frame remains displayed while only the appropriate places of the frame are updated with the scroll data.

Thus, Hills fails to describe, either expressly or inherently, at least two browser components, each *selectable by a software control for display* of an additional electronic page as recited in Claim 1. In contrast to the system of Claim 1, the scroll frame and update frame described by Hills are hidden from the user and not selectable for display.

Claim 10 recites a method of processing information using a computer network, the method comprising, *inter alia*, “downloading an electronic main page from a server computer to a client computer, wherein the main page comprises at least two browser components for displaying additional electronic pages within the main page” The method further comprises “providing at least one software control on the electronic main page for selection of one of the at least two browser components, wherein each of the browser components are selectable by the at least one software control; and displaying the downloaded electronic main page, wherein a first one of the browser components *displays a first electronic page, and wherein activation of the software control results in a second one of the browser components displaying a second electronic page.*”

Appl. No. : **09/912,646**
Filed : **July 24, 2001**

Applicant respectfully submits that Hills fails to describe a method of processing information as recited in Claim 10, including specifically “wherein a first one of the browser components *displays a first electronic page, and wherein activation of the software control results in a second one of the browser components displaying a second electronic page.*” As discussed above in reference to Claim 1, the apparatus described by Hills only displays the display frame, and scroll data from the scroll frame is populated to the appropriate places of the display frame. Thus, Hills fails to teach displaying a second electronic page.

In regard to the Examiner’s comments with respect to interpretation of the claims, Applicant refers the Examiner to Applicant’s specification at page 10, lines 24-29, describing an exemplary implementation of the invention of Claim 1. The example application includes multiple browser components presented in a unified graphical user interface that utilizes a tabbing system. An exemplary user interface window having a plurality of tabs is illustrated in Figure 17. Applicant also refers the Examiner to the exemplary description at page 19, lines 4-11, describing how a browser component linked to a selected tab is moved to the front position of the desktop for display to the user, while the pages within the other browser components are hidden. As a user selects a tab corresponding to a different browser component, the electronic page corresponding to the browser component is moved to the front of the desktop and displayed to the user.

As the prior art of record fails to teach every element of each of Claims 1 and 10, Applicant respectfully submits Claims 1 and 10 for further review as patentable subject matter.

Because Claims 2, 4-9, 11, and 13-18 depend from Claims 1 and 10, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 4, they incorporate by reference all the limitations of the claim to which they refer. It is therefore submitted that these claims are in condition for allowance at least for the reasons expressed with respect to the independent claim, and for their other features.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 3 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,239,797 to Hills, et al. as applied to Claims 1 and 10 above, and further in view of the MSHTML API Overview.

Appl. No. : 09/912,646
Filed : July 24, 2001

Because Claims 3 and 12 depend from Claims 1 and 10, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 4, they incorporate by reference all the limitations of the claim to which they refer. It is therefore submitted that these claims are in condition for allowance at least for the reasons expressed with respect to the independent claim, and for their other features.

Conclusion


Applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the outstanding Office Action. Accordingly, amendments to the claims for patentability purposes pursuant to statutory section 102. In light of these amendments and remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: January 5, 2006

By: 
Michael L. Fuller
Registration No. 36,516
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550

2206279
121405